REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 10 being independent. Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Examiner still finds allowable subject matter in Claims 9 and 14.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-8, 10-13, and 15-16 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Takada* (U.S. 5,850,477) in view of *Sachs et al.* (U.S. 5,956,034). Additionally, as indicated above, Claims 9 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 10, the Examiner asserts that *Takada* teaches all the recitations of these claims, except for resizing the entry field to be suitable for the input data's size whenever input data is input to the generated entry field, which is allegedly taught in *Sachs*.

Again, the Examiner refers to FIG. 12B of *Takada*, interpreting the division of the handwritten stroke data 51, which is originally contained in a rectangular region 52, into two separate pieces of stroke data 53 and 54, which subsequently divides the rectangular region 52 into two regions, as being an equivalent of an entry field generating portion for generating at least one displayed entry field inside a boundary line when the user draws the boundary line for forming an entry frame. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, neither the rectangular region 52, nor the divided rectangular region 52, in *Takada* is an equivalent of at least one displayed entry field inside a boundary line. Rather, the rectangular region 52 is merely illustrated in *Takada* for better explaining how *Takada* divides already input handwritten stroke data 51. That is, the rectangular region 52 is theoretically generated after the stroke data 51 is input. The rectangular region 52 in *Takada* is not an equivalent of an entry field inside a boundary line, when the user draws the boundary line for forming an entry frame. Input data is input to the generated entry field in independent Claims 1 and 10, but not in the rectangular region 52 in *Takada*, which is merely a representation of a perimeter around already input stroke data 51.

Further, the process for dividing the input stroke data 51 into two separate pieces of stroke data 53 and 54 also does not generate at least one displayed entry field inside a boundary line, wherein input data is input to the generated entry field. Instead, after the stroke data 51 is input, *Takada* calculates a perimeter of the stroke data 51, and then divides the input stroke data 51 into two separate pieces of stroke data 53 and 54. No entry field is generated inside a boundary line, wherein input data is input to the generated entry field.

Basically, FIG. 12B of *Takada* merely divides already input stroke data 51 into two separate pieces of stroke data 53 and 54. *Takada* does not generate at least one displayed entry field inside a boundary line, wherein input data is input into the generated entry field, as is recited in independent Claims 1 and 10.

Additionally, *Sachs* fails to cure this deficiency of *Takada*.

Further, the Examiner admits that *Takada* fails to teach resizing the entry field to be suitable for the input data's size whenever input data is input to the generated entry field, but asserts that this recitation is taught in *Sachs*. Applicants respectfully disagree as *Sachs* merely teaches that the size of the font of text 110 is displayed and can then be enlarged or reduced.

More specifically, *Sachs* teaches changing the size of the fonts for previously input data, but fails to teach or suggest resizing an entry field. Referring to FIG. 3B, *Sachs* merely teaches selecting "change font" icon 122 to change the current font size.

Further, *Sachs* clearly states in col. 6, lines 16-18 that a font size is changed when the icon 122 is pressed by the user. However, *Sachs* fails to teach or suggest that the entry field is resized whenever input data is input to the generated entry field, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10.

Accordingly, *Sachs* fails to cure the admitted deficiencies of *Takada*.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 10 are patentably distinct over *Takada* in view of *Sachs*, and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 10 is respectfully requested.

While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, and 16 are also allowable for at least being dependent upon independent Claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-16, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475